



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
2 NAVY ANNEX  
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

JRE  
Docket No: 5470-00  
10 January 2001

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your late husband's naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 4 January 2001. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your husband's naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. His official military personnel file was obtained from the record repository on 13 December 2000.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. In this regard, the Board noted that your husband underwent a pre-separation physical examination on 4 November 1958. Item 39 of the examination report, which pertains to identifying body marks, scars and tatoos, is marked as "NORMAL", and no reference to tatoos was made elsewhere on the form. Your husband signed the form, which indicates that he examined it, and presumably had nothing to add to it. The Board felt it was significant that the examination report form initially indicated that no significant defects were noted on clinical evaluation, and that a diagnosis of strabismus was subsequently added to the form. This indicated to the Board that the physician who conducted the examination was careful and conscientious, and that he would have recorded any tatoos that were present at that time had he noted them. The fact that a Chronological Record of Medical Care was changed to indicate that it was a Chronological Abstract of Service is of no significance. As indicated by entries on the form, it is nothing more than an abstract of service. Its purpose is to show his major units and dates of assignment during his enlistment, to include the period following his release from active duty. The entry "NOT PRESENT FOR PHYSICAL EXAMINATION" refers to the date of 1 June 1962, when the health record was being closed-out due to your husband's discharge from the Naval Reserve.

In view of the foregoing, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER  
Executive Director